

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed January 12, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. It is respectfully asserted that no new matter has been added.

Applicants have amended claim 5, 7, 9, and 10 to clarify their invention and to eliminate reliance on acronyms. Claims 5-10 remain pending in this application.

Claims 5-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0254469 to Verma et al. (hereinafter "Verma et al.").

Applicants assert that Verma et al. does not teach the following limitations of Claim 5:

receiving in the wireless LAN from the mobile wireless terminal identity information previously used by the mobile wireless terminal to access the wireless telephony network;

identifying a serving node in the wireless telephony network that last served the mobile wireless terminal prior to transitioning to the wireless LAN in accordance with the identity information received from the mobile wireless terminal in the wireless LAN, the identity information including ~~Packet Temporary Mobile Subscriber Identity (PTMSI)~~ a temporary mobile subscriber identity, a temporary P-TMSI signature and a ~~Routing Area~~ routing Identifier (RAI);

forwarding the identity information of the mobile wireless terminal to the last-accessed serving node in the wireless telephony network for identification;

receiving from the last-accessed serving node in the wireless telephony network an identification response indicating whether the mobile wireless terminal has been properly identified; and

validating the mobile terminal in accordance with the identification response.

Applicants also assert that Verma et al. does not teach the following limitations of Claim 9:

a serving node for identifying the mobile wireless terminal upon access to the wireless telephony network; and

an access server for receiving from the wireless LAN temporary identity information from the mobile wireless terminal previously used by the terminal to access the wireless telephony network and for identifying the serving node in the first wireless network that last served the mobile

wireless terminal prior to transitioning to the second wireless network by forwarding the identity information of the mobile wireless terminal to the serving node for identification and from the identification response, the access server indicating whether the mobile wireless terminal has been properly identified and forwarding such response to the wireless LAN to validate the mobile wireless terminal by the WLAN, the temporary identity information including a Packet Temporary Mobile Subscriber Identity (P-TMSI), a P-TMSI signature and a Routing Area Identifier (RAI) a mobile subscriber identity, a temporary signature and a routing identifier.

The Verma et al. application concerns to a wireless local area network (WLAN) as a public land mobile network for WLAN/telecommunication system interworking. In particular at paragraph 0016, the Verma et al. application discloses a network architecture in which:

“...the Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) coverage area interacts with a Universal Mobile Telecommunications system (UMTS) network as another Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) through an inter-PLMN backbone.”

Note that Verma et al. does not claim a temporary signature, such as a P-TMSI, and routing identifier, such as a RAI, as noted by the Examiner. Rather, Verma et al. simply mention these terms, but do not disclose their use for validation purposes as recited in applicants' claims 5-10. Thus, applicants maintain the examiner rejection inapplicable.

For example, at paragraph 0041, Verma et al. discloses that “The routing area change is updated, accepted in step 127 and completed in step 128. In step 129, P-TMSI (packet Temporary Mobile Subscriber Identity) reallocation may be performed and completed if needed.” In contrast, Claims 5 and 9 affirmatively recite the use of a temporary identity, (e.g., a P-TMSI), along with a temporary signature, (e.g., a P-TMSI signature) and a routing identifier, (e.g., a RAI), to validate a mobile terminal. To the extent that Verma et al. makes mention of the P-TMSI, they do so by suggesting that P-TMSI reallocation MAY occur if needed. Moreover, Verma et al. uses the P-TMSI in a different manner than as a temporary identity as recited in claims 5 and 9. For example, as shown in FIG. 5 of their application, Verma et al. perform P-TMSI reallocation after security validation, (at step 129), and not as part of the validation functions performed

earlier at step 106. Thus, Verma et al do not use the P-TMSI for validation of the mobile terminal as recited in claims 5 and 9.

As described in their application at page 2, lines 26-28, applicants invention serves to overcome the problem that:

Current wireless LANs lack secure user identification and verification mechanisms. A potential security risk currently exists for users seeking to transition to a wireless LAN from a wireless telephony network. Thus, there is a need for a technique for protecting the identity of a user when transitioning from one wireless network to another”

In contrast, at Paragraph 0036 of their application, Verma et al. state:

“When a subscriber is in a WLAN coverage area, security functions may be handled between MS 40 and IWF-SGSN 44 in step 106 in the **same way as if it were in a UMTS coverage area**. Additional security procedures may be provided in step 107 to **authenticate the new IWF-SGSN 44.**”

Thus, this cited portion of Verma simply discloses that known security functions corresponding to the UMTS coverage area can apply between the MS 40 and IWF-SGSN. However, simply using known security techniques does not disclose or render obvious claims 5 and 9 which recite a novel technique to implement authentication while maintaining the user's identity secure.

Additionally, while the preceding portion of Verma et al. discloses **authenticating the new IWF-SGSN**, claims 5 and 9 recite the step of **identifying and validating the mobile terminal** upon a transition of the terminal from a wireless telephony network to a wireless Local Area Network, a feature not taught by Verma et al.

Further, FIG. 5 of Verma et al. illustrates that the P-TMSI used in regard to step 129 passes from the new IWF-SGSN to the new MSC/VLR, and not in the manner recited in claims 5 and 9. For example, as recited in Claim 5, the WLAN uses the identity information to identify the last serving node in the previous network. The WLAN forwards that information to the last serving node for an identification response

indicating whether the mobile terminal has been properly identified, so that the WLAN can validate the mobile terminal in accordance with the identification response provided by the last serving node. Moreover, as recited in Claim 9, an access server receives the identity information for forwarding to the last serving node in the first wireless network for identification. Based on the identification response from the last serving node, the access server can properly identify the mobile terminal.

At paragraph 44, Verma et al. disclose the following:

If the UMTS SGSN covers one routing area (RA) and the WLAN coverage area is another RA, the WLAN IWF can broadcast the new routing area identified (RAI) (pre-allocated by the UMTS network). By comparing the RAI stored in user equipment (UE) or mobile station (MS) in GPRS Mobile Management (GMM) context with the RAI received from the IWF, the MS or UE detects that an RA update (inter-SGSN) needs to be performed. The procedure is described with reference to FIG. 5

In contrast to the preceding disclosure of Verma et al, Claims 5 and 9 recite that temporary identity, along with temporary signature and the routing identifier, comprise part of the identify information that sent from the mobile terminal to the WLAN, to achieve validation/proper identification.

Thus, Verma does not teach or suggest all of the above-recited limitations of Claims 5 and 9. A reference cited against a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 must disclose each and every limitation of the rejected claim. Accordingly, independent Claims 5 and 9 patentably distinguish over Verma for at least the reasons set forth above.


Claims 6-8 depend from Claim 5 and, thus, include all the elements of Claim 5. Claim 10 depends from Claim 9 and, thus, include all the elements of Claim 9. Accordingly, Claims 6-8 and 10 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over Verma for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 5 and 9, respectively.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the accompany remarks, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If, however, the Examiner believes such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Kindly charge the cost of the additional independent claim, as well as any other fees that may be due, to Deposit Account **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shaily Verma et al.



By: Robert B. Levy  
Reg. No. 28,234  
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing, Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
March 17, 2006